FILED SERVED ON ENTERED 1 COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD DEC 2 7 2010 3 CLERK US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA DEPUTY 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 14 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 15 TERENCE DICKINSON, an CASE NO.: 2:08-CV-00023 RCJ GWF individual, 16 17 Plaintiff, HON. ROBERT C. JONES 18 ORDER DENYING 19 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, a DISTRICT JUDGE TO foreign limited liability company; 20 RECONSIDER ORDER RE HSBC BANK USA NA; DELTA CLERK'S JUDGMENT AND 21 FUNDING CORPORATION, foreign MOTION FOR OFFER OF **PROOFS** corporation; FIDELITY MORTGAGE 22 OF NY, a trade name; and QUALITY 23 LOAN SERVICE CORPORATION, a foreign corporation, 24 25 Defendants. 26 27 28

ECIVILIO(WES)Dickmon/43052/Pkip/PROPORDER3/doc

Plaintiff's [57] Motion for District Judge to Reconsider Order re [56] Clerk's Judgment, and [58] Motion for Offer of Proofs, was heard on October 20, 2010 at approximately 9:00 a.m. in Department 7D of the above-entitled Court. Jeffrey S. Allison, of Houser & Allison, APC, appeared on behalf of Defendants named as OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, and HSBC BANK USA, N.A. Plaintiff, TERRENCE DICKINSON appeared in pro se.

The Court having considered the moving and opposing papers, oral argument, matters or record and its own files, and good cause appearing, denies Plaintiff's Motions on grounds set forth in the record including the following:

In the Court's view, Plaintiff's instant and second Motion to Reconsider [57] presents nothing new by way of material admissible evidence to warrant further reconsideration. As alleged and established on the record, Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the subject refinance loan and foreclosure thereof.

On the date of the hearing of Plaintiff's prior motion to reconsider the Court's Order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss and judgment, Plaintiff represented to the Court words to the effect that there was no loan, and therefore no debt on which to foreclose. However, the record reflects and the Court is of the belief that Plaintiff knew there was a debt on the refinance loan that closed and paid off old loans. To the extent of the issue of Plaintiff's alleged notice of rescission of the loan under the Federal Truth-in-Lending Act, Plaintiff must offer or tender back the net loan funds received and have an ability to do so if it were

alleged or established that a timely rescission of the loan was properly made to the appropriate parties. Plaintiff did not do so.

At the hearing, again Plaintiff made a bald misrepresentation to the Court with words to the effect that the loan never closed. The Court indicated that it did not believe the Plaintiff and that it granted Defendants' motion to dismiss.

Plaintiff's motion to reconsider was initially denied. However, the Court gave Plaintiff the option to bring a subsequent motion for reconsideration and/or submit proof that the loan had not closed. Plaintiff did not do so. Apparently, Plaintiff misrepresented the matter to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals indicating that it was Defendant's burden to bring such a motion or submit further proof.

This is simply not true. The Court tried to prevent what in its opinion was a fraud being perpetrated by Plaintiff. As ultimately determined, it was Plaintiff's burden to submit any such motion or proof that the loan did not close and/or concerning his alleged rescission. Again, Plaintiff did not do so. By subsequent Order as directed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Court clarified its ruling and confirmed entry of Judgment with prejudice in favor of Defendants.

For these reasons and those set forth in the record, including that with his instant Motion to Reconsider Plaintiff has not presented new admissible evidence material to warrant further reconsideration of the Court's rulings, Order, or Judgment;

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's instant Motion to Reconsider [57] is DENIED. Plaintiff's Motion for Offer of Proofs [58] is DENIED as moot. DATED: December 27, 2010